1	2	3
5.	Jharkhand	The Court is of the view that there is no requirement to establish AIJS in terms of recommendation of the First National Pay Commission.
6.	Rajasthan	AIJS may be constituted provided that it does not dilute the provisions of Article 235 of the Constitution of India.
7.	Gujarat	The High Court is not in favour of formation of AIJS
8.	Andhra Pradesh	The High Court has not expressed any view since the matter relating to establishment of AIJS has already been considered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India on judicial side
9.	Madhya Pradesh	The High Court is not in favour of formation of AIJS as the conditions in the Higher Judicial Service in Madhya Pradesh have improved substantially after the implementation of the recommendations of the Shetty Pay Commission with regard to pay, allowances and other service conditions and after amendment of the recruitment rules pursuant to the judgment of Supreme Court in All India Judges Case
10.	Madras	The Madras High Court is not in favour of AIJS.
11.	Patna	The High Court is in favour of constituting an AIJS in the light of judgment in W.P. No. 1022 of 1989 (All India Judges Association and others versus UOI.
12.	Kerala	The High Court of Kerala does not assent to the proposal for creation of AIJS since the creation of All India Judicial Service would cause practical difficulties,.
13.	Uttarakhand	High Court of Uttarakhand has informed that the present system of recruitment by the High Court in Higher Judicial Service be maintained.
14.	Bombay	The High Court has decided not to form All India Judicial Service

Disclosure of assets

1914. DR. JANARDHAN WAGHMARE: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government feels that it is necessary that like the Members of Parliament and State Assemblies, Judges, administrators and people's representatives at all levels including Panchayati Raj should declare their assets and liabilities; and

(b) if so, the steps proposed to be taken in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY): (a) and (b) The Government is considering to bring in a comprehensive legislation on the issue of accountability of Judges wherein it is also proposed to deal with the subject of declaration of assets and liabilities by Judges of the Supreme Court and High Courts.

As regards administrators and people's representatives; information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.

Setting up of family courts

1915. SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) whether all the States and Union Territory Administrations have set up family courts in all the districts under their territorial jurisdiction;

(b) if not, the States and UTs lagging behind in this regard alongwith the number of districts where family courts have not been established so far; and

(c) what remedial measures Government proposes to take in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY): (a) No, Sir.

(b) A Statement indicating the number of Family courts functioning State-wise is enclosed. No Family Courts are functional in other States/UTs. Information regarding the number of districts where Family Courts have not been established is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.

(c) All the State Governments have been requested from time to time to set up Family Courts in their State so as to cover all the Districts.

Statement

Number of family courts functional as reported by the concerned high Court/State Government

Sl. No.	Name of the State	Number of Family Courts functional in the State
1	2	3
1.	Andhra Pradesh	27
2.	Jharkhand	8
3.	Maharashtra*	4
4.	Orissa	2
5.	Puducherry	1